



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,592	07/24/2001	Ralph S. Hoefelmeyer	COS-00-019	3657
25537	7590	03/06/2006	EXAMINER	
MCI, INC 1133 19TH STREET NW 4TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 20036				CHEN, SHIN HON
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2131		

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/911,592	HOEFLMEYER ET AL.
	Examiner Shin-Hon Chen	Art Unit 2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed, after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-15 have been examined.

### ***Double Patenting***

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 10 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/024,202. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: both applications claim a scanning system, an anti-virus server, and a switch for performing the same virus protection procedures.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6785732 (hereinafter Bates).

6. As per claim 1, Bates discloses a network security system to be deployed between a plurality of intranets (Bates: column 3 lines 42-47; column 7 lines 23-27: the web client can be any computer including intranet servers) belonging to respective organizations and an internet backbone, comprising: a scanning system coupled to the intranets for scanning incoming electronic mail for malicious code (Bates: column 2 lines 10-13); an anti-virus server coupled to the intranets for downloading anti-virus code to clients coupled to the intranets (Bates: column 2 lines 39-41: download anti-virus code to clients); a switch between the scanning system, and the anti-virus server (Bates: figure 3: the web server allows different security applications), said

switch configured for: directing incoming electronic mail from the internet backbone to the scanning system (Bates: column 7 line 66 – column 8 line 11: the data are re-directed to the server for checking). Bates does not explicitly disclose a switch between the Internet backbone, scanning system, and the anti-virus server. However, since Bates discloses a server appliance instead of servers executing different security applications, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a connection between the Internet backbone, the scanning system, and the anti-virus server in a distributed computing environment. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to create multiple servers for each respective application in a distributed environment, since the applicant has not disclosed having multiple server for different applications solve any stated problem or for a particular purpose, it appears that the server appliance would work equally well without separating the applications into different servers.

7. As per claim 3, Bates discloses a network security system to be deployed between a plurality of intranets (Bates: column 3 lines 42-47; column 7 lines 23-27: the web client can be any computer including intranet servers) belonging to respective organizations and an internet backbone, comprising: a scanning system coupled to the intranets for scanning incoming electronic mail for malicious code (Bates: column 2 lines 10-13); a mail proxy server for determining whether the incoming electronic mail is to be scanned for malicious code and directing the incoming electronic mail to the scanning system when the incoming electronic mail is determined to be scanned for malicious code (Bates: figure 3 and column 7 line 66 – column 8 line 11); an anti-virus server coupled to the intranets for downloading anti-virus code to clients

coupled to the intranets (Bates: column 2 lines 39-41: download anti-virus code to clients); a switch between the scanning system, and the anti-virus server (Bates: figure 3: the web server allows different security applications), said switch configured for: directing incoming electronic mail from the internet backbone to the mail proxy server (Bates: column 7 line 66 – column 8 line 11: the data are re-directed to the server for checking). Bates does not explicitly disclose a switch between the Internet backbone, scanning system, and the anti-virus server. However, since Bates discloses a server appliance instead of servers executing different security applications, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a connection between the Internet backbone, the scanning system, and the anti-virus server in a distributed computing environment. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to create multiple servers for each respective application in a distributed environment, since the applicant has not disclosed having multiple server for different applications solve any stated problem or for a particular purpose, it appears that the server appliance would work equally well without separating the applications into different servers.

8. As per claim 5, 8, and 10, claims 5, 8, and 10 encompass the same scope as claim 1. Therefore, claims 5, 8, and 10 are rejected based on the reasons set forth in claim 1.

9. Claims 2, 4, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Network Associates, Inc. "Network Associates Ships Cyberscop Sting-Industry's first 'Decoy' Server Silently Traces and Tracks Hacker Activity" (hereinafter NAI).

10. As per claim 2, 4, 7, and 9, Bates discloses the system of claims 1, 3, 5, and 8 respectively. Bates does not explicitly disclose a decoy server coupled to the intranets for masquerading as a legitimate server and logging activity on communications received via the internet backbone; wherein the switch is further coupled to the decoy server and is further configured for redirecting suspicious traffic from the internet backbone to the decoy server. However, NAI discloses decoy server is used to trace and track hackers and reporting all intrusive activities (NAI: page 1). It would have been obvious one having ordinary skill in the art to include decoy server into the web server system because Bates and NAI both are applied within a network anti-virus environment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of NAI within the system of Bates because it provides additionally security measure to web clients.

11. Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of NAI and further in view of Caccavale U.S. Pub. No. 20020129277 (hereinafter Caccavale).

12. As per claim 6 and 11, Bates as modified discloses a network security system according to claims 5 and 10 respectively. Bates as modified as modified does not explicitly disclose wherein the switches are further configured for: load-balancing among the scanning systems and among the decoy servers. However, Caccavale discloses perform load-balancing procedure when there are plurality of virus checking programs (Caccavale: [0012]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the

teachings of Caccavale within the combination of Bates-NAI because load-balancing is well known in the art to prevent denial of service attack and it increases efficiency of the process.

13. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of NAI and further in view of Kim et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6701440 (hereinafter Kim).

14. As per claim 12-15, Bates as modified discloses the system of claims 1, 3, 8, 10 respectively. Bates does not explicitly disclose a hub in communication with the scanning system and the intranets, wherein the scanning system is further configured for sanitizing at least some of the incoming electronic mail addressed to recipients on the intranets and directing the sanitized incoming electronic mail to the recipients via the hub. However, Kim discloses scanning and sanitizing e-mail messages directed to web clients and the system provides plurality of servers for handling different tasks of the e-mail delivery system (Kim: column 3 lines 32-44 and column 5 lines 7-24 and figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide sanitizing function to disinfect infected data prior to delivering data to web clients. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Kim within the combination of Bates-NAI because it is well known in the art to try to repair virus-infected data prior to transmission to clients.

***Response to Arguments***

15. Applicant's arguments, see Appeal Brief, filed 12/27/05, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-15 under 102/103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior arts.

***Conclusion***

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Knight U.S. Pub. No. 20040255167 discloses method for remote network security management involving plurality of different security servers.

Bandini et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20020169954 discloses method for secure e-mail transmission.

Albrecht U.S. Pub. No. 20010005889 discloses remote computer virus scanning.

Chen et al. U.S. Pat. No. 5832208 discloses anti-virus agent for use with database and mail servers.

Liu et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20020147780 discloses method for scanning electronic mail to detect and eliminate computer viruses using e-mail scanning servers and recipient's e-mail gateway.

Leppek U.S. Pub. No. 20010001156 discloses integrated network security access control system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shin-Hon Chen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2131

SC

CHRISTOPHER REVAK  
PRIMARY EXAMINER



314106